APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,313	02/25/2004	Ravipal S. Soin	MSFT-3501/300585.03	3447

23377   7590   10/02/2007
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/786,313	SOIN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jason Recek	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 February 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-56_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-56_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _14 and 30_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 February 2007_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _25 February 2004_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application 10/786313 filed on February 25th 2004 in which

claims 1-56 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-56 are pending, of which 1, 19, 33, 44 and 49 are in independent form.

Claims 14 and 30 are currently objected to.

Claims 19-32 and 49-56 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second

paragraph.

Claims 16, 18-32 and 49-56 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-21, 23-30 and 49-56 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 3, 7-9, 11-12, 14-15, 22 and 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

Claim Objections

1.   A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim

refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any

claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind

that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general,

applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: it depends from a

dependent claim and is separated by claims which do not also depend from said

dependent claim. Appropriate correction is required.

2.   Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "said

computing" in line 3 is missing the word "device". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16, 18-32 and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The scope of patentable

subject matter is defined by Section 101 as any "new and useful process, machine,

manufacture, or composition of matter." The term "computer readable medium" as used

herein refers to any medium or signal that is usable by a processor. The passage of the

disclosure presents evidence that Applicant intends for "medium" to cover more than

just physical articles or objects which are functionally interconnected with the

instructions as to make a computer functional. Transmission type media includes wires

and fiber optics but may also take the form of carrier waves. Carrier waves or signals

are non-statutory subject matter. Since Applicant's disclose (paragraphs 38 and 48)

mentions signals it is assumed the term "medium" is meant to cover these signals as

well as physical articles. Thus claims 16, 19 and 49 are rejected because they are

directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 18 is rejected because it specifically claims "a modulated data signal"

which is not patentable subject matter.

Claims 20-32 and 40-56 are rejected for depending from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 19 and 49 recite "At least one computer

readable medium..." the phrase "at least one" raises a question as to the scope of the

claim because it cannot be determined where the computer executable instructions are

being stored. For example, the system consists of multiple computer devices "other

computing devices" thus it is impossible to determine where the medium that is claimed

is located and ultimately where the executable instructions are being stored.

Claims 20-32 and 50-56 are rejected for depending from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-21, 23-30 and 49-56 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Masumoto et al. U.S. Pat. 6,943,752 B2.

Regarding claim 1, Masumoto discloses "selecting via a first user interface

mechanism of the computer device content for transmission to at least one alternate

display device" as a presentation system where content is selected and transferred from

one computer to a display device (col. 4 ln. 65 – col. 5 ln. 7), "said content includes

public content and private content" as some of the content is not displayed on the

display device (col. 5 ln. 15-21), "displaying on said computing device said content

including both said public content and said private content" as showing all content on

the computer (Fig. 5), and "transmitting at least said public content of the selected

content to the at least one alternate display device, wherein if a public/private

mechanism is enabled on said computing device, when said content is rendered on the

at least one alternate display device, only the public content is rendered" as transmitting

content to the display device and only displaying part of the content (col. 5 ln. 15-21,

Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 2, Masumoto discloses "transmitting includes establishing a

remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the at least

one alternate display device" as the computer and display device are connected on a

wireless network (col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol.

Regarding claim 4, Masumoto discloses "authoring said content" as creating the

presentation (col. 13 ln. 47-78).

Regarding claim 5, Masumoto discloses "publishing said content" as sending it to

the display device (col. 15 ln. 59-61, Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 6, Masumoto discloses "content authored before said publishing

is said public content and wherein at least one alternation to said public content after

said publishing is said private content" as modifying data after it is published (col. 15 ln.

62-67, Fig. 18).

Regarding claim 10, Masumoto discloses "the content is substantially

simultaneously displayed on the at least one alternate display device in response to

said transmitting" as showing the display simultaneously (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 13, Masumoto discloses "said content is a slide presentation" as

a slide presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 16, Masumoto discloses "a computer readable medium [that

performs the method of claim 1]" as Masumoto operates on a computer system and

thus necessarily includes a computer readable medium (col. 5 ln. 1-5).

Regarding claim 17, Masumoto discloses "a computing device comprising means

for performing the method of claim 1" as a computer which is capable of performing the

method claimed (col. 5 ln. 1-5).

Regarding claim 18, Masumoto discloses "data signal [for performing claim 1]" as

signals necessarily exist in computer systems.

Regarding claims 19-21, 27, 29 they are substantially similar to claims 1, 6, 5, 10,

12 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 23-24 they are similar to claims 9 and 8 respectively and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 25-26 they are similar to claims 6 and 9 respectively in that claim 6 refers to designating an alteration as private and claim 9 refers to making, deleting and highlighting a private portion, thus they are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 28 and 30 Masumoto discloses "controlling the rendering" and "controls rendering of said at least one public portion and said at least one private portion" as selecting what content to show (col. 5 ln. 15-19).

Regarding claims 49-56 they are substantially similar to claims 19-21, 23-24 and 27-29 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Masumoto in view of Parsons, Jr. et. al U.S. Pat. 6,349,337 B1.

Regarding claim 3, Masumoto does not disclose "the remoting protocol is the

remote desktop protocol and the remote session is a terminal services (TS) session"

however this is taught by Parsons, Jr. as using the Remote Desktop Protocol (col. 6 ln.

43-50) which would necessary include a terminal session.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use RDP with Masumoto for the purpose of connecting to a device over a

network. Remote Desktop Protocol is well known in the art, yields predictable results,

and is suggested by Parsons, Jr.

5.   Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Masumoto in view of Orfitelli et al. U.S. 6,904,451 B1.

Regarding claim 7, Masumoto discloses "designating [...] at least one portion of

the content as private content" as displaying only a portion of the content (col. 5 ln. 15-

19) however Masumoto does not disclose doing this "via a second user interface

mechanism" but this is taught by Orfitelli as a touch screen computer that is used to

control a presentation (col. 3 ln. 31-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Masumoto by adding a second user interface as taught by Orfitelli.

The motivation for doing so is to allow the presenter to quickly and easily modify the

presentation data without retreating to a laptop or other computing device (i.e. server)

that may be positioned across the room.

Regarding claim 8, Masumoto discloses "said authoring includes designating at

least one alternation of said public content as private content" marking data as

comments so they are not displayed to the public (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

Regarding claim 9, Masumoto discloses "said authoring includes designating at

least one of a masking, a deletion, and a highlighting of said content as private content"

as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15

ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

6.   Claims 11-12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Masumoto in view of Zhang et al. "Software Solution to Completely Wireless

Presentation" 2001.

Regarding claim 11, Masumoto does not disclose "controlling the display of the

public content on said at least one alternate display device via a second user interface

mechanism on said computing device" however this is taught by Zhang as a user

interface for application presentation (content selection) and a user interface for

controlling the presentation (control mechanism) see pg. 463 section 4.4 User Interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Masumoto by providing another user interface for the purpose of

controlling the presentation. The motivation for doing so is to project a clear image of

the content.

Regarding claim 12, Masumoto discloses "said controlling includes controlling a

rate of viewing of said content via at least one input device of said computing device" as

a computer connected to a projector in which the computer controls the presentation

(col. 5 ln. 2-3, Fig. 1), also a remote control may used (col. 5 ln. 4-5, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 32, Masumoto discloses "at least one projector device" as a

projector (col. 5 ln. 2, Fig. 5). Masumoto does not disclose "at least one available other

notebook computer" however this is taught by Zhang as other laptop computers that are

connected to the network (page. 459 section 1 Introduction, Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Masumoto by adding additional computing devices to the network

for the purpose of having more displays. Zhang teaches that if other laptops are

connected users can see the presentation on their own screen.

7.   Claims 33 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Zhang in view of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 33, Zhang discloses "a server" as a server (pg. 460 section 3),

"a user interface" as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), and "a transmitter" as all

computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter

(pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose "public content and private content"

nor "only the public content is rendered" however this is taught by Masumoto as having

public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig.

5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught

by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation

for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without

allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 34, Zhang discloses "an authoring tool" as the server is connected to the projector and thus must contain the presentation software (pg. 460 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 35, Zhang discloses "a publishing tool" as the server must "publish" the material to the projector / other computing devices (pg. 460 section 3.1, pg. 462 section 4.3 Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 36, Zhang does not disclose "said publishing is said public content and wherein at least one alteration to said public content after publishing with the publishing tool is said private content" however this is taught by Masumoto as converting data from public content to private content (col. 15 ln. 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 37, Zhang does not disclose "at least one portion of the content is designated as private content via said user interface" however this is taught by Masumoto as designated portions as private content (col. 17 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 38, Zhang does not disclose "at least one alteration of said public content made via said authoring tool is designated as private content" however this is taught by Masumoto as designating private content, such content can be an alteration of said public content (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 39, Zhang does not disclose "at least one alteration includes at least one of a masking, a deletion, an annotating and a highlighting" however this is taught by Masumoto as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67),

deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16

ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught

by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation

for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without

allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 40, Zhang discloses "the rendering of the public content on said

at least one client display device is controlled via said user interface" as controlling a

display through a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4)

Regarding claim 41, Zhang does not specifically disclose "control of a rate of

display" however Masumoto teaches using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50)

and a slide presentation inherently has a rate control.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation

applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 42, Zhang does not specifically disclose "said content is a slide

presentation however this is taught by Masumoto as using slides for a presentation (col.

1 ln. 49-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation

applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 43, neither Zhang nor Masumoto expressly disclose "transmits

only said public content of the selected content to the at least one client display device"

however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only

showing the public content. Masumoto teaches "hiding" the private content rather than

not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for

transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what

Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it

private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 44, Zhang discloses "a user interface" as a user interface (pg.

463 section 4.4), "means for displaying" as laptop with a display screen (pg. 459 section

1), and "means for transmitting" as all computing devices are in wireless communication

so they must include a transmitter (pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose

"public content and private content" nor "only the public content is rendered" however this is taught by Masumoto as having public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claims 45-48, they are substantially similar to claims 36-37, 40 and 43 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons given above.

8.   Claims 14-15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto.

Regarding claim 14, Masumoto does not expressly disclose "displaying via a second user interface mechanism an indication of a signal strength associated with the remote session" however this is well known in the art when dealing with wireless networks to display a signal strength, it yields predictable results in that a user will know when a signal (network) is available.

Regarding claim 15, Masumoto does not expressly disclose "transmitting only said public content of the selected content to the at least one alternate display device" however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches "hiding" the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 31, it is substantially similar to claim 15 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

9.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto in view of Acharya et al. US 2005/0036509 A1.

Regarding claim 22, Masumoto does not specifically disclose "said computing device is a stylus pen input device and said publishing includes printing said at least one public portion to a journal" however this is taught by Acharya as using PDAs as the wireless computing device and printing content to be presented (paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to using PDAs for the computing devices and to print a copy of the

presentation. Such techniques are widely known and yield predictable results.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Kawasaki et al. US 2004/0217948 A1 discloses a wireless presentation system.

Phillips US 2003/0157928 A1 discloses a database wireless presentation

system.

Hodzic et al. US 2003/0218597 A1 discloses an interactive wireless presentation

system.

Hsiao US 2003/0081561 A1 discloses a wireless projector.

Youden U.S. Pat. 7,027,035 B2 discloses an image copying device.

Chang et al. US 2002/0059415 A1 discloses outputting data to another device

after a discovery / selection process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jason Recek whose telephone number is (571) 270-

1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason Recek
09/24/07

FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER